

Coast Province Resource Advisory Committee

07/24/2003 Meeting

LaSells Stewart Center

Corvallis, OR

Attendees: PAC Members- George Buckingham, Rennie Ferris, Ron Phillips, Barry Wulff, Kim Gossen, Michael Carrier, Julia Dougan, Denis Williamson, Johnny Sundstrom, Mandy Cole, Greg Norton, Alan Henning, Lee Folliard, Bob Rees, Annabelle Jaramillo

BLM: Randy Gould . Forest Service: Joni Quarnstrom, Carl Frounfelkner, Bob Turner, John Zapell (notetaker)

Welcome: Joni welcomed members and introduced new members

George Buckingham addressed the meeting with an introduction and update on fire danger levels on the forest as well as the region.

Randy gave a brief introduction on the Salem BLM.

Julia presented a brief introduction concerning the Eugene BLM.

RAC update: George updated the group on the status of the project selection from the Siuslaw Resource Advisory Committee. George told the group he would bring a list of selected projects when it is completed.

Julia gave an update of Eugene BLM Resource Advisory Committee. All projects were selected at their last meeting. She discussed briefly the types of projects selected.

Denis gave an update of Salem Resource Advisory Committee project proposals. Meeting hasn't taken place yet. Denis presented a brief example of types of projects presented.

Alan asked Denis about the process the RACs use for selecting projects by priorities. Discussion about this process and how it may be applied using the current legislation. Selection process differs by RAC.

Rennie asked question concerning the incident involving the Lincoln County crew. A member developed an allergic reaction to a bee sting but was treated appropriately. He stressed the need for training when dealing with these types of incidents.

Siuslaw Stewardship Pilot: Bob Turner and Carl Frounfelker made a presentation on the on the Siuslaw Steawardship Pilot via a powerpoint presentation.

Bob presented information on the program and working with local communities, contractors, and interested parties. The presentation centered on the differences between the Pilot Program and the recent legislation. Carl described how the retention of receipts through the stewardship was divided into 3 categories. 1-Overhead 15%, 2- Contracting 20%, 3-Projects on the ground 65%.

Carl spoke about the parties of interest and what they bring to applying the projects with a variety of backgrounds in fisheries, environment, and watershed enhancement.

Bob stressed the monitoring of the projects and its importance in the success of the program. In Addition he and Carl stressed the importance of the commitment of line officers to the success of the Stewardship Program.

Question: Does the Stewardship Program need to adhere to the Northwest Forest Plan. Yes!

Question: If the funding generated is sufficient to continue past the timeline authorizing the program, can we continue? Bob described that the goal is to balance the funds at the end of the authority period.

Question: How do you expand outside the program? Frontload the collaboration with partners and shareholders.

Question: was there any resistance from the counties? Bob stated that they are willing to wait and see how the program works during the pilot period.

PL108-7, Sec 323(10-year authority) expands the ability of agencies to apply stewardship projects. Will put tighter controls of receipts and funds and reduces some of the flexibility of the Stewardship Program.

At the end of the presentation, Carl and Bob asked how the PAC sees their involvement in the future of Stewardship?

1030 BREAK

Continuation of discussion on Stewardship Program. Ron asked Bob and Carl how they felt about the program to get the FS perspective. Carl stated that the program works well for the Siuslaw NF, but might not for all national forests. Unsure about the 10-year program, but is satisfied with the Pilot Project.

Bob stated that he was enthusiastic about the flexibility of the current program, the cooperation of partners and shareholders, and the support of the line officers on the Forest.

Ron-if the program is “sold right” it should be supported by the various RACs because of the high potential for on-the-ground projects.

Johnny- gave his historic perspective on relationships between the local communities and the Forest, as well as background on his efforts with the Stewardship Pilot. He stated that at this time there is true collaboration on the Siuslaw Stewardship Program and that we are in a sensitive position in regards to the success of this pilot, as well as the future of the program. He encouraged the support of the PAC for the future of the program.

Kim- appreciates what she has heard about the program, but is tentative about the future of the program as it relates to the environment and NEPA.

Michael asked for clarification on the current Pilot Program and on the 10-year legislation, and the success of future projects using the proposed tighter controls of the 10-year authority. He proposed extending the current pilot project under existing authority for an additional 5-year period to determine viability between the pilot and 10-year authority.

Alan would like a flow diagram and field visit of present projects to see how things are being implemented.

Johnny is working on a report to Congress on the Stewardship Pilot that he said would be available for the next PAC meeting in October.

George asked if Bob thought that the Pilot would be extended under the 10-year authority. Bob said that he's heard a variety of versions and is unsure.

Randy- there is potential for conflicts between agencies as they interpret the authority of using Stewardship and will need to work closely.

Johnny- downsizing of the Forest Service emphasizes the need for collaboration between the agency and partners i.e.; communities, watershed councils.

Is there flexibility on the forest level for determining policy and guidelines? Where do we need to put our emphasis; locally, regionally? Would it be good to have someone in contracting from the region office on the board of directors to provide a closer connection between the Forest and the RO?

Flexibility in the current Pilot Program is much greater than in the proposed 10-year authority.

Alan felt that engaging the RO contracting office could very likely facilitate greater success. Bob told the group that the contracting officers at the RO haven't shown any negative attitudes toward the Siuslaw Pilot, but are hesitant in spreading the stewardship to other Forests.

Rennie-need to build on trust and to emphasis retaining receipts on local forests to complete necessary work.

PAC Subcommittee Presentation- (Joni gave a brief overview of the direction given to the subcommittee by Gloria Brown for reviewing the stewardship program)

Subcommittee went through the 18 interim guidelines in the federal register and provided comments on these. Joni passed to those in attendance the comments for discussion by the entire PAC, which will be passed back to the federal register. These comments will be used to try to shape the guidelines of the 10-year authority.

Rennie- discussion on the stewardship program will continue to come up at future PAC meetings regardless of what guidelines are finalized in the 10-year authority.

Discussion:

No. 1- Need to focus comments to the Coast Range Province, in light that other committees, groups will be providing comments to these interim guidelines.

Johnny would like to change wording to reference “forest and rangelands more naturally resistant to disturbance.

No. 2- PAC agreed to the current wording.

No. 3- Correct “phrases” to read “phases”. Other changes suggested add “the” in front of various.

No. 4- PAC agreed

No. 5- Residual receipts, where do they stay? In the Forest under current pilot program. Recommend that they stay with the Forest. Rennie recommend a 5b to reflect the BLM authority. “Residual receipts will remain within the forest or BLM District in which they were generated.

No. 6- Question; who pays for NEPA? Does this require more work for agency staffs?

No. 7- Remove the words “and guidelines” and add “and” before “regulations”.

No. 8- Change the word “may” to “shall”.

No. 9- First sentence, change “allow” to “allowing”.

LUNCH

Continue with the subcommittee comments.

No.10- Add the sentence provided by the subcommittee to the end of the guideline.

No. 11- PAC agrees

No. 12- Remove “if supported by local collaborative process” and “subject to available funding”.

No.13- PAC agrees with recommendation.

No. 14- Pac agrees with recommendation.

No. 15- PAC agrees with recommendation.

No. 16- PAC agrees with recommendation.

No. 17- Ron brought up concerns about utilizing residual stewardship revenues for administrative costs and overhead, due in part to possible abuse of this guideline. Discussion ensued about this point and use of funds on additional work on other stewardship projects.

Change wording to “use of receipts is limited to direct on-the-ground project implementation, monitoring, and the completion of environmental study and analysis for further future stewardship projects”.

Place caveat to read, “See the Law, Sec 347, 5F2B”.

No. 18- Add, “...based on the recommendation of the Forest Supervisor or District Manager”.

Need to get these comments put together for submittal, along with a cover letter from the PAC.

Rennie made a motion that the PAC submit a cover letter and comments and send to the Federal Register and Regional Forester.

Joni called for a show of hands from those in attendance. Motioned passed with a unanimous “Yes” vote.

Discussion- the cover letter needs to accompany the comments to the Regional Forester and not the Federal Register. The PAC agreed and will include the cover letter only to the Regional Forester.

Send the PAC’s comments to Regional and State offices re; Stewardship guidelines.

Discussion- to add a Number 19 to the guidelines pertaining to continuing existing pilot projects under existing authority. The PAC agreed that they would not add an additional guideline (No. 19).

Ron presented his concerns for including socio-economic benefits addressed. He doesn’t see the emphasis on this issue.

Mandy and George suggested that the PAC address the socio-economic issues in a future meeting and keep the economic subcommittee together.

George would like to see the economic subcommittee go over the draft stewardship guidelines.

Randy would like the PAC to assist in strategizing the new stewardship authority. Review monitoring report and build next meeting's agenda.

Public comment: none

Round Robin:

Rennie to agency personnel; What if the proposed volume from the Biscuit recovery hits the market? How will that affect log prices. Also, how is the poison oak issue on fires being addressed?

Ron- Sensing a major change at the national level and hopes to see it continue.

Barry- Marys Peak portion of Sierra Club is pursuing trail to the coast. Also 5 members met with Fs and BLM about trail maintenance needs on Marys Peak. The group will be working on Labor Day.

Kim- Trying to catch up with Chuck Willer. Will fill group in at next meeting

Mandy- Tourism and information sharing, national Visitor Use Monitoring Survey, State offices asking for Forest Plan revisions information, and presenting training to visitor center managers on the forest passes.

Lee- implementation monitoring trip scheduled for July 29, 30, 31. 5-year reviews on the spotted owl and marbled murrelet, putting out request for proposals on evaluation of studies. Reviews scheduled to be completed 2004. Continue to see appeals on Biological Opinions.

George- Attended a Regional Leadership Team meeting in Bend. The Chief of the Forest Service shared his emphasis items with the leadership members. (Fire and Fuels, Invasive Species, Fragmentation, and Unmanaged Recreation, in particular OHV recreation). He lauded the collaboration of R6 forests with partners and communities.

Incident management teams and management of incidents; the Chief feels that the agency can't effectively manage incidents as currently organized, and continue to complete necessary work.

Denis- motorized recreation is also an issue. He is also dealing with budget and staffing issues. Fire is also an issue, with high to extreme fire danger.

Julia- Echoed the same emphasis items as the Chief expressed. Upper Siuslaw Restoration EIS will be on the street.

Randy- Passed

Bob- Gave a brief introduction of himself as a new PAC member. Bob is representing Recreation through the Sport Fishing Industry. He is encouraged to be a part of the committee.

Greg-pass

Johnny- He has been in Nebraska working with groups on how to address issues involving the endangered species act. Was also in Denver dealing with issues concerning water, grazing, etc. The Siuslaw Partnership has been selected as a finalist in the international RiverPrize to be awarded in Brisbane, Australia., in September.

Next Meeting: October 23, 2003. Location: somewhere on the Coast!